



GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
 Intellectual Property Causes
 1950 Roland Clarke Place
 Reston, VA 20191
 (703) 716-1191

Attorney Docket No. P20144

BB/

In re application of: Carol GRUCHALA et al.

Application No. : 09/886,046

Filed : June 22, 2001

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
 Group Art Unit : 2642

For : IDENTIFICATION OF CALLING DEVICES DIALING A UNIVERSAL NUMBER TO
 ACCESS A TELECOMMUNICATIONS RELAY SERVICE CENTER

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents

Commissioner for Patents

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is an **Appeal Brief Under 37 C.F.R. 41§.37** in the above-captioned application.

Small Entity Status of this application under 37 C.F.R. 1.9 and 1.27 has been established by a previously filed statement.

A Request for Extension of Time.

No additional fee is required.

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

Claims After Amendment	No. Claims Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Small Entity		Other Than A Small Entity	
			Rate	Fee	Rate	Fee
Total Claims: 14	20	0	x25=	\$	x 50=	\$ 0.00
Indep. Claims: 3	3	0	x100=	\$	x200=	\$ 0.00
Multiple Dependent Claims Presented			+180=	\$	+360=	\$ 0.00
Extension Fees for _____ Month(s)				\$		\$ 0.00
Appeal Brief Filing Fee						\$500.00
* If less than 20, write 20 ** If less than 3, write 3			Total:	\$	Total:	\$500.00

Please charge my Deposit Account No. 19-0089 in the amount of \$_____.

A check in the amount of \$500.00 to cover the filing fee is included.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge payment of the following fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

Any additional filing fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16.

Any patent application processing fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17, including any required extension of time fees in any concurrent or future reply requiring a petition for extension of time for its timely submission (37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3)).

W. Pieprz
 Bruce H. Bernstein
 Reg. No. 29,027

W. Pieprz
 William Pieprz
 Reg. No. 33,630



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellants: Carol Gruchala et al.

Confirmation No.: 5446

Appln No. : 09/886,046

Group Art Unit: 2642

Filed : June 22, 2001

Examiner: Karen L. Le

For : IDENTIFICATION OF CALLING DEVICES DIALING A UNIVERSAL
NUMBER TO ACCESS A TELECOMMUNICATIONS RELAY
SERVICE CENTER**APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. §41.37**

Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

This appeal is from the Examiner's rejection of claims 15-28, as set forth in the Final Official Action of September 8, 2005.

A Notice of Appeal was filed on November 8, 2005 in response to the Final Official Action of September 8, 2005, and the two-month period for response was set to expire on January 9, 2006 (January 8, 2006 falling on a Sunday). The requisite fee for filing an Appeal Brief under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c) is submitted herewith.

However, if for any reason the necessary fee is not associated with this file or the attached fee is inadequate, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the fee for the Appeal Brief and any necessary extension of time fees to **Deposit Account No. 19-00089**.
01 FC:1402 500.00 OP

(1) REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST

The real parties in interest are SBC Operations Inc. and SBC Properties L.P., as established by assignments recorded in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 15, 2001, at Reel 012257 and Frame 0108; on April 25, 2003, at Reel 013974 and Frame 0542; on April 25, 2003, at Reel 013986 and Frame 0525; and on April 25, 2003, at Reel 014015 and Frame 0689.

(2) RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

No related appeals and/or interferences are pending.

(3) STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-14 (Cancelled)

Claims 15-28, all of the claims pending in this application, stand finally rejected and are the subject of this appeal. Appellants Appeal the final rejection of claims 15-28.

A copy of claims 15-28 is attached as an Appendix to this brief.

(4) STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS

No amendments to the claims were filed under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 after the Examiner's final rejection of the claims of September 8, 2005.

(5) SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Initially, Appellants note that the following descriptions are made with respect to the independent claims and include references to particular parts of the specification. As such, the following are merely exemplary and are not a surrender of other aspects of the present disclosure that are also enabled by the present specification and that are directed to equivalent structures or methods.

The present claims relate to a method of providing identification information of a

calling party to a telecommunications relay service center when the caller is connected to the telecommunications relay service center by dialing a universal telephone number. The present claims also relate to reliably forwarding identifying information about a calling device to a telecommunications relay service center. (Specification, page 1, lines 1-5, and page 3, lines 13-15).

Independent claim 15 recites a method for routing a call to a telecommunications relay service center, the call being initiated in response to a calling party inputting a universal telephone number into a communications device, the method comprising: establishing a communications connection between the communications device and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line; and forwarding a charge number (CN) to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line.

In this regard, exemplary embodiments of the present specification are shown in Figures 1-4 and disclosed at page 8, line 16 to page 16, line 23. The exemplary embodiments disclose a method for routing a call to a telecommunications relay service center (290), the call being initiated in response to a calling party inputting a universal telephone number into a communications device (S301), the method comprising: establishing a communications connection between the communications device and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line (S302-S306; S501-511; page 8, lines 16-20); and forwarding a charge number (CN) to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line (S506; page 8, lines 16-20; page 15, lines 21-26; page 16, lines 20-23).

Independent claim 24 recites a telecommunications system that routes a call to a telecommunications relay service center, the call being initiated in response to a calling party inputting a universal telephone number into a communications device, the telecommunications system comprising: a service switching point that establishes a communications connection between the communications device and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line, the service switching point forwarding a charge number (CN) to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line; and a service control point that communicates with the service switching point, the service control point translating the universal telephone number into a telephone number corresponding to the telecommunications relay service center.

In this regard, exemplary embodiments of the present specification are shown in Figures 1-4 and disclosed at page 8, line 16 to page 16, line 23. The exemplary embodiments disclose a telecommunications system that routes a call to a telecommunications relay service center (290), the call being initiated in response to a calling party inputting a universal telephone number into a communications device (S301), the telecommunications system comprising: a service switching point (211) that establishes a communications connection between the communications device and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line (S302-S306; S501-S511; page 8, lines 16-20), the service switching point forwarding a charge number (CN) to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line (S506; page 8, lines 16-20; page 15, lines 21-26; page 16, lines 20-23); and a service control point (260) that communicates

with the service switching point, the service control point translating the universal telephone number into a telephone number corresponding to the telecommunications relay service center (S412).

Independent claim 27 recites a computer readable medium storing a computer program that routes a call to a telecommunications relay service center, the call being initiated in response to a calling party inputting a universal telephone number into a communications device, the computer readable medium comprising: a communications connection establishing code segment that establishes a communications connection between the calling party and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line; and an identification information forwarding code segment that forwards a charge number (CN) of the calling party to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line.

In this regard, exemplary embodiments of the present specification are shown in Figures 1-4 and disclosed at page 8, line 16 to page 16, line 23. The exemplary embodiments disclose a computer readable medium (page 18, line 15 to page 19, line 8) for storing a computer program that routes a call to a telecommunications relay service center (290), the call being initiated in response to a calling party inputting a universal telephone number into a communications device (S301), the computer readable medium comprising: a communications connection establishing code segment that establishes a communications connection between the calling party and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line (S302-S306; S501-S511; page 8, lines 16-20); and an identification information forwarding code

segment that forwards a charge number (CN) of the calling party to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line (S506; page 8, lines 16-20; page 15, lines 21-26; page 16, lines 20-23).

(6) GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

(A) The Rejection of Claims 15-17 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105.

(B) The Rejection of Claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, in view of MORRISEY (U.S. Patent No. 5,524,146), and further in view of PELTZ-STRAUSS (ex parte letter and comments from the National Association of the Deaf submitted to the Federal Communications Commission on August 2, 1999).

(C) The Rejection of Claims 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, in view of KEATING et al. (comments from the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International and the National Emergency Number Association submitted to the Federal Communications Commission on September 14, 1998).

(D) The Rejection of Claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET 92-105, in view of BRESLIN (ex parte letter and comments from Bell Atlantic submitted to the Federal Communications Commission on August 2, 1999).

(7) ARGUMENT

(A) The Rejection of Claims 15-17 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 is Improper, and the Decision to Reject Claims 15-17 and 27-28 on this Ground Should be Reversed.

In the Final Official Action of September 8, 2005, claims 15-17 and 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105. However, the rejection of each of claims 15-17 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 is improper and should be reversed. In this regard, Appellants hereinbelow addresses the rejection of independent claims 15 and 27 and dependent claims 16-17 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 in the numerical order of the claims.

(1) Claim 15

FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the features recited in claim 15, as required for the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be proper. In this regard, claim 15 recites "establishing a communications connection between the communications device and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line; and forwarding a charge number (CN) to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line". FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the above-noted features of claim 15.

Before addressing the explicit teachings of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, Appellants would like to explain the differences between "charge number" as recited in Appellants' claims (and the related features recited in Appellants' claims) and "automatic number identification" (ANI) as disclosed in FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105.

In this regard, "automatic number identification" refers broadly to a field for the telephone number from which a calling party places a call. However, this "automatic number identification" is not the same field, and does not always contain the same

information, as a "charge number". Accordingly, automatic number identification and charge number represent distinct concepts, are considered separately in a telecommunications environment, and cannot be assumed to be the same or equivalent. Automatic number identification may be used where charge number may not, and charge number may be used where automatic number identification may not.

The charge number can be used to determine the originating location of a call. The invention recited in claim 15 can be used to reliably provide the charge number (CN) as an identifier in situations where automatic number identification (ANI) is not reliably provided.

The outstanding Final Official Action acknowledges, at page 3, that FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not explicitly disclose forwarding a charge number to a telecommunications relay service center. However, the Final Official Action asserts that FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 either inherently discloses such a feature, or that it would be obvious to modify FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 to include such a feature. Both of these assertions are in error.

In this regard, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 teaches storing information as a consumer profile at a telecommunications relay service center and accessing the information of a consumer's profile to determine a consumer's carrier of choice. However, this does not constitute an inherent teaching that the stored information includes a "charge number" as recited in claim 15, let alone that the "charge number" has been forwarded to the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line in the context recited in claim 15. For example, there are some circumstances where a charge number cannot be reliably passed to a

telecommunications relay service center in the context of claim 15, and other circumstances where automatic number identification cannot be so passed. Accordingly, not only are the above-noted features of claim 15 not "inherent" in FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, but the above-noted features of claim 15 may be "impossible" in some scenarios which occur in the telecommunications systems as described in FCC DOCKET NO. 92-15. In any case, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not disclose, teach or even contemplate the use of charge number; rather, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 merely discloses the receipt and use of automatic number identification (ANI).

Furthermore, unless a "charge number" is received with (or based upon) a particular call, there would be no reliability in using an ANI to "guess" a charge number based on a calling party's profile, as is impliedly suggested in the Final Official Action. In this regard, retrieval of a profile for a calling party (e.g., based upon recognition of the party or automatic number identification) would not provide a proper basis for "guessing" a charge number associated with costs for a particular call. Rather, such a parameter would have to be continually provided with each call for such a parameter to be considered reliable at the time of the call. In other words, there is no definite correspondence between automatic number identification and charge number, and a charge number in a predetermined profile at a destination could not be reliably used where only an automatic number identification is received.

In any case, the Final Official Action attempts to incorrectly establish equivalence between the "calling party number" and a "charge number" at, e.g., page 3, lines 5-6 and page 9, lines 10-11. As described above, the failure to distinguish between calling party number (i.e., automatic number identification) and charge number in the outstanding

Final Official Action is improper and renders the entire rejection fatally defective.

The Final Official Action also asserts, at page 3, that "the called center needs to know the exact source of the call... because the called center is paying for the call". However, as described above, FCC '105 only describes identifying the source of the call from automatic number identification. In this regard, called centers do not require a "charge number" to identify the source of calls and, in fact, cannot receive a "charge number" over certain types of trunk lines and equipment. Thus, there is no basis for the assertion in the Final Official Action that a "charge number" is inherently provided in FCC '105.

In other words, charge number and automatic number identification are two different parameters in a telecommunications environment. A charge number does not always correspond to an automatic number identification, and automatic number identification does not always correspond to a charge number. Further, a charge number may be forwarded over particular types of trunk lines, over which an automatic number identification may not be forwarded. The opposite is also true in that an automatic number identification may be forwarded over particular types of trunk lines, over which charge number may not be forwarded. In contrast to the invention recited in claim 15, there is no consideration in FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 of forwarding a charge number to a telecommunications relay service center. Accordingly, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not even contemplate the problems addressed by exemplary embodiments of the present application, wherein a charge number may be reliably forwarded in circumstances where an automatic number identification may not be, such as may be the case with a signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line.

Further, there is no motivation in the prior art to modify the teachings of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 to include the above-noted features recited in claim 15. In this regard, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 addresses forwarding automatic number identification over a multifrequency trunk and does not in any way even recognize that in some environments automatic number identification may not always be reliably forwarded, such as with signaling system 7 feature group D trunk lines. Accordingly, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not recognize a problem addressed by the exemplary embodiments of the present application, let alone that FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 would solve such a problem.

Further, while a variety of parameters may be used depending on the type of trunk line, there is no consideration in FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 to using anything other than a multifrequency trunk group and automatic number identification. The failure of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 and the prior art generally to consider the variety of available options is a problem addressed by the invention recited in claim 15. However, there is no proper motivation in FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 to modify the teachings thereof to obtain the invention recited in claim 15. Rather, the only motivation to modify the teachings of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 is the improper motivation of the Examiner to obtain Appellants' claims in hindsight.

Accordingly, a charge number, as recited in the claims of the present application, is not the same as or rendered obvious by an automatic number identification. Furthermore, a signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line as recited in claim 15 is not the same as or rendered obvious by a multifrequency feature group D trunk line. As no consideration is provided in FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 of the above-noted features

recited in claim 15, the invention recited in claim 15 is not disclosed, suggested or rendered obvious over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105.

Accordingly, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the above-noted features recited in claim 15. In particular, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not provide any teaching or consideration of "establishing a communications connection between the communications device and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line", as is recited in claim 15. Furthermore, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not provide any teaching or consideration of "forwarding a charge number (CN) to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line", as is recited in claim 15.

Accordingly, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the above-noted features of claim 15. Because the reference applied by the Examiner in rejecting claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the features recited in claim 15, the rejection of claim 15 is inappropriate.

Additionally, no other reference applied in the outstanding Final Official Action discloses, suggests or renders obvious the above-noted features recited in claim 15; nor has the Examiner asserted that any other reference discloses or suggests such features. Further, there has been no assertion, let alone a proper showing, of any motivation in the prior art to modify FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 to obtain the above-noted features recited in claim 15.

(2) Claims 16-17

Claims 16-17 are allowable, at least for the reason that these claims depend from

claim 15, respectively, and because these claims recite additional features that further define the invention recited in claim 15. Further, claims 16-17 are separately patentable over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 which fails to disclose or render obvious, in the claimed combination, *inter alia*,

- (i) ascertaining a toll free telephone number in response to the input universal telephone number, the toll free telephone number corresponding to the telecommunications relay service center (claim 16); and
- (ii) determining whether the charge number has been previously received at the telecommunications relay service center;
 - when the charge number has not been previously received:
 - creating a profile of a user of the communication device; and
 - storing the profile of the user for the use of the telecommunications relay service center;
 - when the charge number has been previously received:
 - associating the charge number with a previously created profile of the user; and
 - updating the previously created profile of the user with information received from the calling device (claim 17).

(3) Claim 27

Appellants note that the above-noted shortcomings of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 are equally applicable to the rejection of claim 27. For example, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not disclose, suggest or render obvious "a communications connection establishing code segment that establishes a communications connection

between the calling party and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line", as is recited in claim 27. Further, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not disclose, suggest or render obvious "an identification information forwarding code segment that forwards a charge number (CN) of the calling party to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line", as is recited in claim 27.

Accordingly, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the above-noted features of claim 27. Because the reference applied by the Examiner in rejecting claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the features recited in claim 27, the rejection of claim 27 is inappropriate.

Additionally, no other reference applied in the outstanding Final Official Action discloses or suggests the above-noted features recited in claim 27; nor has the Examiner asserted that any other reference discloses or suggests such features. Further, there has been no assertion, let alone a proper showing, of any motivation in the prior art to modify FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 to obtain the above-noted features recited in claim 27.

(4) Claim 28

Additionally, claim 28 is allowable, at least for the reason that this claim depends from claim 27, and because this claim recites additional features that further define the invention recited in claim 27. Further, claims 28 is separately patentable over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 which fails to disclose or render obvious, in the claimed combination, *inter alia*,

(i) a telephone number determining code segment that determines a toll free

telephone number in response to the input universal telephone number, the toll free telephone number corresponding to the telecommunications relay service center (claim 28).

Accordingly, for each and all of the reasons noted above, the rejection of claims 15-17 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is inappropriate and unsupported by the teachings of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105. Therefore, Appellants respectfully request that the decision of the Examiner to reject claims 15-17 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reversed, that the application be returned to the Examiner for withdrawal of the rejection over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, and that an early allowance of claims 15-17 and 27-28 be issued.

(B) The Decision to Reject Claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, in view of MORRISEY (U.S. Patent No. 5,524,146), and further in view of PELTZ-STRAUSS (ex parte letter and comments from the National Association of the Deaf submitted to the Federal Communications Commission on August 2, 1999) is Improper, and the Decision to rejection claims 18-19 on this Ground should be Reversed.

In the Final Official Action of September 8, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 in view of MORRISEY, and further in view of PELTZ-STRAUSS. The rejection of each of claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 is improper and should be reversed.

Claims 18-19 are allowable, at least for the reason that these claims depend from claim 15, respectively, and because these claims recite additional features that further

define the invention recited in claim 15. Claims 18-19 are separately patentable over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 which fails to disclose, suggest or render obvious, in the claimed combination, *inter alia*,

- (i) determining, from the charge number, a state corresponding to a location of the communication device (claim 18); and
- (ii) finding a toll free telephone number corresponding to the telecommunications relay service center for (claim 19).

Accordingly, for each and all of the reasons noted above, the rejection of claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is inappropriate and unsupported by the teachings of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, in view of MORRISEY, and further in view of PELTZ-STRAUSS. Therefore, Appellants respectfully request that the decision of the Examiner to reject claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reversed, that the application be returned to the Examiner for withdrawal of the rejection over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, in view of MORRISEY, and further in view of PELTZ-STRAUSS, and that an early allowance of claims 18-19 be issued.

(C) The Decision to Reject Claims 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, in view of KEATING et al. (comments from the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International and the National Emergency Number Association submitted to the Federal Communications Commission on September 14, 1998) is Improper, and the Decision to Rejection Claims 20-23 on this Ground should be Reversed.

In the Final Official Action of September 8, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims

20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, in view of KEATING. However, the rejection of each of claims 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 in view of KEATING is improper and should be reversed.

Claims 20-23 are allowable, at least for the reason that these claims depend directly or indirectly from claim 15, and because these claims recite additional features that further define the invention recited in claim 15. Further, claims 20-23 are separately patentable over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 in view of KEATING which fail to disclose or render obvious, in the claimed combination, *inter alia*,

(i) wherein the telecommunication relay service center is equipped with memory and graphical displays that display identifying information (claim 20);

(ii) counting the number of times a calling number has called the telecommunications relay service center (claim 21);

(iii) wherein the identifying information comprises the location of the calling party and a phone number associated with the communications device (claim 22); and

(iv) wherein the profile is used for planning and billing purposes (claim 23).

In this regard, the Examiner asserts that it would be obvious to modify the teachings of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 with the teachings of KEATING, but does not cite any motivation in either FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 or KEATING to apply the teachings of KEATING to the teachings of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105.

Accordingly, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 in view of KEATING does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the above-noted features of claims 20-23. Because the references applied by the Examiner in rejecting claims 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) do not disclose, suggest or render obvious the features recited in claims 20-23, the rejection

of claims 20-23 is inappropriate.

Accordingly, for each and all of the reasons noted above, the rejection of claims 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is inappropriate and unsupported by the teachings of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, in view of KEATING. Therefore, Appellants respectfully request that the decision of the Examiner to reject claims 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reversed, that the application be returned to the Examiner for withdrawal of the rejection over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105, in view of KEATING, and that an early allowance of claims 20-23 be issued.

(D) The Decision to Reject Claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET 92-105, in view of BRESLIN (ex parte letter and comments from Bell Atlantic submitted to the Federal Communications Commission on August 2, 1999) is Improper, and the Decision to Reject Claims 24-26 on this Ground Should be Reversed.

In the Final Official Action of September 8, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET 92-105 in view of BRESLIN (ex parte letter and comments from Bell Atlantic submitted to the Federal Communications Commission on August 2, 1999). However, the rejection of each of claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET 92-105 in view of BRESLIN is improper and should be reversed.

In this regard, Appellants hereinbelow addresses the rejection of independent claim 24 and dependent claims 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 in view of BRESLIN in the numerical order of the claims.

1. Claim 24

Appellants note that the above-noted shortcomings of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 (as discussed with respect to claim 15) are equally applicable to the rejection of claim 24 (which is rejected over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 in view of BRESLIN). For example, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not disclose, suggest or render obvious "a service switching point that establishes a communications connection between the communications device and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line", as is recited in claim 24. Further, FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 does not disclose, suggest or render obvious "the service switching point forwarding a charge number (CN) to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line", as is recited in claim 24.

Further, Appellants note that BRESLIN is applied only for the teachings relating to the generic usage of service switching points and service control points, and not to the particular features of the service switching point recited in claim 24. Accordingly, even if FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 was modified with the teachings of BRESLIN, Appellants' claim 24 would not be disclosed, suggested or rendered obvious by the combination.

2. Claims 25-26

Claims 25-26 are allowable, at least for the reason that these claims depend directly or indirectly from claim 24, and because these claims recite additional features that further define the invention recited in claim 24. Further, claim 25-26 are separately patentable over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 in view of BRESLIN which fail to disclose or render obvious, in the claimed combination, *inter alia*,

- (i) wherein the service control point determines an originating state from the

charge number, and determines a telephone number corresponding to the telecommunications relay service center for the originating state; and

(ii) wherein the charge number enables the telecommunications relay service center to identify the communications device.

Accordingly, for each and all of the reasons noted above, the rejection of claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is inappropriate and unsupported by the teachings of FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 in view of BRESLIN. Therefore, Appellants respectfully requests that the decision of the Examiner to reject claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reversed, that the application be returned to the Examiner for withdrawal of the rejection over FCC CC DOCKET NO. 92-105 in view of BRESLIN, and that an early allowance of claims 24-26 be issued.

(8) CONCLUSION

Each and every pending claim of the present application meets the requirements for patentability under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and the present application and each pending claim thereof are allowable over the prior art of record.

Should there be any questions, any representative of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Carol Gruchala et al.

William Pieprz
Reg. No. 33,630


Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

January 9, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

CLAIMS APPENDIX

Claims 1-14 (Cancelled)

15. (Previously Presented) A method for routing a call to a telecommunications relay service center, the call being initiated in response to a calling party inputting a universal telephone number into a communications device, the method comprising:

establishing a communications connection between the communications device and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line; and

forwarding a charge number (CN) to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line.

16. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 15, further comprising:

ascertaining a toll free telephone number in response to the input universal telephone number, the toll free telephone number corresponding to the telecommunications relay service center.

17. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 15, further comprising:

determining whether the charge number has been previously received at the telecommunications relay service center;

when the charge number has not been previously received:

creating a profile of a user of the communication device; and

storing the profile of the user for the use of the telecommunications relay service center;

when the charge number has been previously received:

associating the charge number with a previously created profile of the user; and

updating the previously created profile of the user with information received from the calling device.

18. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 15, further comprising: determining, from the charge number, a state corresponding to a location of the communication device.

19. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 18, further comprising: finding a toll free telephone number corresponding to the telecommunications relay service center for the state corresponding to the location of the communications device.

20. (Previously Presented) The telecommunications method of claim 15, wherein the telecommunication relay service center is equipped with memory and graphical displays that display identifying information.

21. (Previously Presented) The telecommunications method of claim 20, further comprising counting the number of times a calling number has called the telecommunications relay service center.

22. (Previously Presented) The telecommunications method of claim 20, wherein the identifying information comprises the location of the calling party and a phone number associated with the communications device.

23. (Previously Presented) The telecommunications method of claim 17, wherein the profile is used for planning and billing purposes.

24. (Previously Presented) A telecommunications system that routes a call to a telecommunications relay service center, the call being initiated in response to a calling party inputting a universal telephone number into a communications device, the

telecommunications system comprising:

 a service switching point that establishes a communications connection between the communications device and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line, the service switching point forwarding a charge number (CN) to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line; and

 a service control point that communicates with the service switching point, the service control point translating the universal telephone number into a telephone number corresponding to the telecommunications relay service center.

25. (Previously Presented) The telecommunications system of claim 24, wherein the service control point determines an originating state from the charge number, and determines a telephone number corresponding to the telecommunications relay service center for the originating state.

26. (Previously Presented) The telecommunications system of claim 24, wherein the charge number enables the telecommunications relay service center to identify the communications device.

27. (Previously Presented) A computer readable medium storing a computer program that routes a call to a telecommunications relay service center, the call being initiated in response to a calling party inputting a universal telephone number into a communications device, the computer readable medium comprising:

 a communications connection establishing code segment that establishes a communications connection between the calling party and the telecommunications relay service center over a signaling system 7 (SS7) feature group D trunk line; and

an identification information forwarding code segment that forwards a charge number (CN) of the calling party to the telecommunications relay service center over the signaling system 7 feature group D trunk line.

28. (Previously Presented) The computer readable medium of claim 27, further comprising:

a telephone number determining code segment that determines a toll free telephone number in response to the input universal telephone number, the toll free telephone number corresponding to the telecommunications relay service center.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None (No Data Available)

RELATED PROCEEDING APPENDIX

None (No Data Available)